UNITED
NATIONS

CERD

International Convention on
the Elimination
of all Forms of
Racial Discrimination

Distr.
GENERAL

CERD/C/SR.1209
9 May 1997

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Fiftieth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1209th MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 19 March 1997, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. BANTON

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS, COMMENTS AND INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 9 OF THE CONVENTION (continued)

Fourth to fourteenth periodic reports of Swaziland

Draft concluding observations of the Committee concerning the United Kingdom, Afghanistan, the Bahamas, the Dominican Republic, Jordan, Nepal and Cameroon

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the Committee at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

GE.97-15955 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS, COMMENTS AND INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES UNDER ARTICLE 9 OF THE CONVENTION (agenda item 5) (continued)

Fourth to fourteenth periodic reports of Swaziland (CERD/C/299/Add.2)

1. At the invitation of the Chairman, the members of the delegation of Swaziland took seats at the Committee table.

2. Mr. DLAMINI (Swaziland) explained that the delay in the submission of Swaziland's periodic reports had been due to changes which had occurred in his country and various other unforeseen developments.

3. Mr. MATSE (Swaziland) summarized the report submitted by his country (CERD/C/299/Add.2), which combined the fourth to fourteenth periodic reports. He drew particular attention to the provisions establishing penalties for acts of racial discrimination contained in the Race Relations Act of 1962 (para. 7), the Employment Act of 1980 (para. 11) and the Citizenship Act of 1992 (para. 12).

4. In connection with the right of association, Parliament was considering a bill to amend the Industrial Relations Act of 1980 (para. 15). In addition, a constitutional reform commission had begun to review certain enactments that were incompatible with the principles of natural law. It was hoped that the commission would also review the Race Relations Act. UNHCR had expressed a favourable opinion of the way in which Swaziland dealt with refugees.

5. Mrs. SADIQ ALI (Country Rapporteur) welcomed the resumption of the dialogue between Swaziland and the Committee, which had been suspended for 20 years or so. Referring to General Recommendation VI, in which the Committee had considered that ratification alone did not enable the control system set up by the Convention to function effectively, she emphasized that the State party must keep the Committee informed of the measures it was taking to ensure the implementation of the Convention by regularly submitting relevant periodic reports.

6. The periodic report under consideration did not fully describe the implementation of all the articles of the Convention, and she urged the delegation of Swaziland to take into consideration the Committee's revised general guidelines regarding the preparation of reports.

7. She asked whether the so-called Tinkhundla electoral system did not have the effect of reducing electors' choice, which would be contrary to the provisions of article 5 (c) of the Convention. Citing paragraph 7 of the report, which stated that the Race Relations Act covered any act of discrimination motivated by race or colour, she observed that racial discrimination, as defined in article 1 of the Convention, had a broader meaning since it covered "any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin".

8. She had noted an apparent contradiction between paragraph 10 of the report, in which it was stated that discrimination on grounds of race or

colour was now unheard of in Swaziland, and reports published by the United States Department of State that there was a feeling of hostility towards expatriates accused of discrimination against the majority. Had the Government taken action on its decision to amend the Race Relations Act in the light of the new forms of racial discrimination and the relevant provisions of the Convention?

9. The same source had stated that in 1996 a national strike had been called off by the trade unions on condition that harassment of trade unionists by the police ceased, that the Swaziland Federation of Trade Unions (SFTU) enjoyed free access to the electronic media and that the Government agreed to international mediation in settling labour disputes. Those reports gave the impression that the provisions of article 5 (e) of the Convention were not implemented in Swaziland.

10. Swaziland should include in its next report information on measures which the Government had taken concerning any ill-treatment, including acts of torture, that might have been perpetrated by the police against private individuals in 1996.

11. The Committee would also like to receive information on action taken pursuant to the intercession by the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights in support of Mr. Jan Sithole, Secretary-General of the SFTU, who had reportedly received death threats from the police, had his passport confiscated and been threatened with deportation to Mozambique. She would also like to know whether the prohibition of political parties imposed 20 years before under the state of emergency was still in force.

12. The decision to maintain the death penalty in Swaziland ran counter to article 5 (a) of the Convention. She would welcome clarification of the situation of the seven people who had been sentenced to death by Swazi courts and had lodged appeals. What was the situation of the judges who had protested against the establishment of a committee to evaluate and punish the professional conduct of judges and other judicial officials, which in their view had jeopardized the independence of the judiciary?

13. In connection with the treatment of refugees, she would like to know more about the frontier incidents in which the Swazi police had reportedly arrested and tortured Mozambican citizens.

14. Referring to a report of the Committee to the General Assembly (A/49/18) in which attention had been drawn to the emergence of new forms of racism against migrant workers, refugees and ethnic minorities, she stressed the need to implement education programmes geared to combating racism and asked whether any programmes of that type existed in Swaziland.

15. Mr. CHIGOVERA requested the Swazi delegation to give details of the situation of the Zulu population who had migrated from KwaZulu and of the status of the Tongas in Swaziland. Were they fully-fledged citizens and were there any programmes aimed at protecting their culture, and notably their language? He also asked for clarification of the expression "7,000 ethnic Swazis" contained in paragraph 13. Did it actually mean Zulus?

16. He stressed the effects of the repeal of the Constitution on the exercise of the rights set out in the Convention, notably with regard to action to combat racial discrimination.

17. The Race Relations Act predated the Convention and was hence less broad in scope; the revised version of the Act should therefore fully incorporate the provisions of the Convention and impose more severe penalties than those laid down at present. To that end, the provisions of the Employment Act should be used as a guide, as they were much broader and consistent with the Convention.

18. Mr. de GOUTTES requested clarification of the scope of the Race Relations Act, which seemed to concern only proprietors or employees of premises open to the public; such a restrictive provision would appear to be at variance with the requirements of article 4 of the Convention.

19. In connection with paragraph 10, in which it was stated that owing to the presence of the Race Relations Act racial discrimination was unheard of in Swaziland, he said the Committee needed further information in order to form an opinion.

20. Like Mrs. Sadiq Ali, he would welcome additional information from the delegation concerning the ill-treatment, violence, threats and arbitrary arrests perpetrated by the police and security forces against opponents.

21. Mr. SHERIFIS, endorsing the observations and questions by Mrs. Sadiq Ali and Mr. Chigovera, noted with satisfaction the fact that Swaziland was treating well the thousands of Mozambican refugees who had settled on its territory; he hoped that in the next report the State party would include information concerning the implementation of article 7 of the Convention. He encouraged Swaziland to endorse the amendment relating to article 8 of the Convention.

22. Mr. AHMADU noted that the report of Swaziland, which covered a very long period, consisted of only four pages. He therefore hoped that the next report would be fuller and would be accompanied by a core document. He observed that, in constitutional terms, Swaziland was confronted with problems similar to those facing Nigeria.

23. He considered the Race Relations Act of 1962 to be somewhat restrictive and asked whether it had been amended and how many cases had been tried under it. The electoral system described in paragraph 4 of the report also seemed restrictive. Was it still in effect? In connection with the legal system described in paragraph 5, he asked whether there was any conflict between the various laws, in particular in the sphere of human rights. Lastly, he would like to know how legislation had been enacted during the period when the Constitution had been abolished and Parliament non-existent.

24. Mr. GARVALOV welcomed the resumption of the dialogue between the Committee and Swaziland. The Government should perhaps seek the assistance of the Centre for Human Rights in preparing its next report and also the core document. It was somewhat surprising to read, in paragraph 10, that due to the presence of the Race Relations Act, "discrimination on the grounds of race

or colour is now unheard of in Swaziland". It was devoutly to be wished that that was the case, but that was the first time a State party had made such a statement.

25. The Citizenship Act of 1992 (paras. 12 and 13) appeared to juggle with the two fundamental principles of citizenship - jus solis and jus sanguinis. It would in fact seem that it was the latter that was applicable in Swaziland. He asked whether persons born in Swaziland but belonging to groups other than the ethnic Swazis, such as the Zulus or the Tongas, automatically had Swazi nationality.

26. Referring to the last sentence of paragraph 4, he observed that there were Western styles of government in which the King did not exercise executive authority.

27. The CHAIRMAN said that Swaziland was in the process of reviewing its legislation in that area and suggested that the delegation should contact the United Nations technical assistance services in order to obtain the text of the relevant legislation in force in countries whose styles of government were similar to those which existed in Swaziland.

28. Mr. DLAMINI (Swaziland) thanked the members of the Committee for their questions and comments, which he took as a sign of encouragement to his country. The questions which the members of his delegation had not answered orally would be taken up in detail in the next report.

29. With regard to the system of electing Members of Parliament (para. 4), he explained that the British-based Constitution had been repealed in 1973 because it had not been functioning. The Tinkhundla system had been installed in 1978 and a Parliament had been reinstated. Since the recent reform of the Tinkhundla system, Members of Parliament had been elected in accordance with a primary system in which the inhabitants of each constituency (of which there were 55) met under the guidance of the community chief to choose the candidates to stand in the general election. That system was more democratic than when the party executive committees designated the candidates. The Members of Parliament were subsequently elected by secret ballot. It should also be pointed out that the public were free to express their views on bills considered by Parliament.

30. On the question of the Zulu population, he said that in 1976 Swaziland's frontiers had been changed, with the result that the country now included the South African territory inhabited by Zulus.

31. The 7,000 ethnic Swazis, who had come from the former KwaZulu-Natal in South Africa, received the same treatment as indigenous Swazis and could obtain a passport and a certificate of citizenship. They were not regarded as refugees, unlike persons from Mozambique. The Tongas, too, were not subjected to discrimination, Swaziland was in fact a homogeneous country.

32. Zulu was not taught in school, but many Swazis spoke it as it had been taught until independence under British rule, which had favoured Zulu over Swazi. French and Portuguese were also taught, in the interests of communication with neighbouring countries.

33. The commission set up to reform the system which had replaced the 1973 Constitution had been mandated to draft a new Constitution. The next report would give fuller information on that subject; the new Constitution was in any case unlikely to be adopted by Parliament before 1998. The procedure was slow, but the authorities considered that the formulation of what would be the highest law of the land should not be hurried.

34. The CHAIRMAN, speaking as a member of the Committee, expressed satisfaction at the constitutional review procedure under way in Swaziland. The length of that procedure was characteristic of a democratic system.

35. Mr. MATSE (Swaziland) said that the commission set up to draft a new Constitution would also have to review legislation whose scope was considered insufficient. However, the definition of racial discrimination contained in the Race Relations Act of 1962 had been expanded.

36. In connection with the allegations by the United States Department of State that expatriates had been attacked in Swaziland, he said that those cases had concerned acts of vandalism against the property of foreign investors. His Government was doing everything in its power to protect such property, but the acts of vandalism did not have racial overtones.

37. The Government had set up a tripartite forum comprising the SFTU, the Employers' Federation and government representatives. The forum was considering the 29 applications, of a legislative, vocational and constitutional character, which the SFTU had submitted to the Government.

38. In the case of Mr. Sithole, Secretary-General of the SFTU, there was so far no evidence that he had received death threats from the police, and the investigation was continuing. Mr. Sithole, who had a Mozambican father and a Swazi mother, was entitled, under the new Citizenship Act of November 1992, to Swazi citizenship and was therefore in no danger of being deported to Mozambique.

39. In Swaziland the press was free. He denied that the police resorted to the so-called "Kentucky methods" of interrogation, as reported by the United States Department of State. An arrest warrant was essential for any person to be arrested.

40. Mr. DLAMINI (Swaziland) stressed that journalists were much freer in his country than in other African countries. However, they were legally obliged to respect the ethics of their profession and not to indulge in sensationalism.

41. There were no political prisoners in Swaziland. Any person who was arrested was informed of the charges against him within 48 hours and could avail himself of the services of a lawyer. He expressed doubts about the truth of the allegations by Amnesty International. In his view, that organization, like the United States Department of State, did not always seek to verify its information sources. In his country prisoners were often better treated than in certain developed countries. He invited the Committee to visit Swaziland in order to see for itself that the above-mentioned reports about his country were unfounded.

42. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Convention did not authorize the Committee to undertake observation missions to countries.

43. Mr. WOLFRUM said that, as a jurist, he would be interested in receiving from the delegation documents on the dual system (para. 5) which had replaced the Constitution in 1973. He agreed with the delegation that constitutional reform must be undertaken in an unhurried fashion. He would also like to know for what reason the Citizenship Act had been amended in 1992. Had the idea been to place men and women on an equal footing? And why had the frontiers of Swaziland been modified just a short time before, given the fact that Swaziland was a very ancient kingdom.

44. Mr. ABOUL-NASR assured the delegation that the Committee did not automatically give credence to reports reaching it from NGOs or other bodies. It mentioned them only in order to elicit the reactions of delegations.

45. Mr. RECHETOV observed that the consideration of reports constituted above all an opportunity for dialogue.

46. Mr. SHAHI thanked the Swazi delegation for its open-mindedness, which had led to a fruitful dialogue with the Committee.

47. Mrs. SADIQ ALI (Country Rapporteur) thanked the delegation for the information it had provided to the Committee. She nevertheless considered that articles 7 and 4 of the Convention should have been dealt with in greater depth. She suggested that the Swazi Government should, in addition to its next report, compile a core document, which could be drafted with the help of the secretariat.

48. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had thus completed consideration of the fourth to fourteenth periodic reports of Swaziland.

49. The Swazi delegation withdrew.

Draft concluding observations of the Committee concerning the fourteenth periodic report of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (CERD/C/50/Misc.1, future CERD/C/304/Add.20, distributed at the meeting in English only) (continued)

Paragraph 4 (continued)

50. The CHAIRMAN invited members to resume consideration of paragraph 4 of the draft concluding observations, which had been left in abeyance, the term "non-incorporation" having given rise to problems.

51. Mr. CHIGOVERA said that he had proposed the deletion of the part of the sentence with which he disagreed, but he was prepared to reword it using appropriate terms.

52. Mr. van BOVEN considered, like Mr. Chigovera, that States parties were not obliged to incorporate the provisions of the Convention in their domestic law. They were free to ensure the implementation of the Convention as they saw fit in the light of their constitutional system. He proposed, although

such wording did not appear to be fully satisfactory, that the words "restrictive interpretation of the provisions" should be replaced by "restrictive interpretation of the full substance".

53. Mr. ABOUL-NASR observed that the reservation expressed by the United Kingdom had not given rise to any objection. It therefore seemed to him to be unfair to criticize the restrictive interpretation of the provisions of article 4.

54. Mr. WOLFRUM proposed that the part of the sentence in question should read: "as well as its reservation, which in effect restricts the interpretation of".

55. Mr. RECHETOV considered that that wording introduced an unnecessary negative element, which could be averted by saying "with regard to the non-incorporation of the provisions of the Convention covering its object and purpose".

56. Mr. CHIGOVERA proposed the following wording which would, he hoped, overcome the difficulties raised: "It is noted that the State party has not given full effect to the provisions of the Convention in its domestic legal order, and in particular that its restrictive interpretation of the provisions of article 4 of the Convention may hamper the full implementation of the provisions of the Convention in the State party".

57. Mr. ABOUL-NASR repeated that the United Kingdom had expressed a reservation to article 4 of the Convention in accordance with its legislation, and that reservation had been accepted. The Committee could recommend the withdrawal of that reservation but could not criticize its restrictive aspect.

58. Mr. WOLFRUM said that great caution should be exercised on the question of reservations. The Committee would shortly draft its concluding observations about a State party which had expressed numerous reservations to the Convention, and he drew attention to article 20, paragraph 2, of the Convention, and in particular the second part of the first sentence of that paragraph, which stipulated that no reservation would be allowed if it had the effect of inhibiting the operation of any of the bodies established by the Convention. There was a lot to say on that subject, but at the present stage the Committee must try to find a wording which was as neutral as possible. He therefore suggested that the Committee should mention the fact that a reservation had been expressed and that it regretted the effect of that reservation.

59. Mr. van BOVEN considered that it was not necessary to refer explicitly to the reservation expressed.

60. Mr. CHIGOVERA said that he would endorse Mr. Wolfrum's proposal in a spirit of compromise, but considered that the Committee, as an organ which monitored the Convention, was perfectly entitled to express critical views.

61. Mr. GARVALOV suggested that the words "with regret" should be deleted, since they were inappropriate in that part of the concluding observations.

62. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the following text of paragraph 4, which took account of the various suggestions made, should be adopted: "It is noted that the State party has not given full effect to the provisions of the Convention in its domestic legal order, and in particular that its reservation in its effect restricts the interpretation of the provisions of article 4 of the Convention and may hamper the full implementation of the provisions of the Convention".

63. It was so decided.

Paragraph 13

64. The CHAIRMAN proposed that, in view of the amendments made to paragraph 4, paragraph 13 should be amended to read: "Concern is expressed that full effect has not been given to the provisions of the Convention within the domestic legal order, and that without a Bill of Rights individuals cannot be protected from any discriminatory practices that have not been prohibited by Parliament".

65. Mr. CHIGOVERA considered that it was not for the Committee to prescribe a mode of legislation to a particular country, much less recommend that it adopt a Bill of Rights. The question was not whether the United Kingdom had adopted such a Bill, but whether the rights of individuals were guaranteed, in one way or another, by British legislation. He therefore proposed that the words "without a Bill of Rights" should be deleted.

66. Mr. RECHETOV endorsed Mr. Chigovera's amendment, but disagreed with the view that a body such as the Committee could not prescribe a mode of legislation to a particular country or make a recommendation on a particular aspect of its legislation. By acceding to the Convention, States parties had undertaken to accept recommendations from the Committee.

67. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee agreed to the amendment proposed by Mr. Chigovera.

68. It was so decided.

Paragraph 14

69. Mr. ABOUL-NASR said that he would raise no objection to the paragraph, even though he was not satisfied with its wording.

70. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt paragraph 14.

71. It was so decided.

Paragraph 22

72. Mr. CHIGOVERA observed that the recommendation contained in paragraph 22 originated from paragraph 13, which had been amended. He proposed that the reference to the "Bill of Rights" should be deleted. Paragraph 22 should

therefore read: "The Committee recommends that the State party consider giving full effect to the provisions of the Convention in its domestic legal order".

73. Mr. ABOUL-NASR considered that that recommendation was redundant and proposed that paragraph 22 should be deleted.

74. Mr. van BOVEN observed that the Committee's concluding observations also served to encourage a national debate between the Government and the parties concerned and that it would be preferable to keep the paragraph.

75. Mr. WOLFRUM proposed that the end of the paragraph should be amended to read: "One means to do so would be the adoption of a Bill of Rights".

76. Mr. GARVALOV, recalling that he had raised the question during the consideration of the United Kingdom report, felt that the Committee was perfectly entitled to make such a recommendation. That type of recommendation did not imply that States were unaware of the provisions of the Convention, but that they were not taking sufficient account of them. In his view, the initial wording of paragraph 22 should be retained.

77. Mrs. ZOU Deci agreed with Mr. Garvalov, particularly since the United Kingdom delegation had informed the Committee that a draft Bill of Rights had been discussed in Parliament.

78. The CHAIRMAN suggested that Mr. Chigovera's amendment of the first part of the paragraph should be adopted and that the reference to the "Bill of Rights" in the second part should be retained.

79. Mr. CHIGOVERA considered that it would be inconsistent to keep that reference, which had been deleted from paragraph 13. His objections remained the same.

80. Mr. RECHETOV said that he was not opposed to the amendment proposed by Mr. Wolfrum, but noted that several members of the Committee supported the retention of the initial wording of the paragraph.

81. Mr. SHAHI considered that the compromise suggested by Mr. Wolfrum was reasonable. The Committee was asking the United Kingdom not to adopt a Bill of Rights, but simply to consider such a step. In view of the suggestions by Mr. Wolfrum and Mr. Chigovera, he proposed that the paragraph should be amended to read: "The Committee recommends that the State party consider giving full effect to the provisions of the Convention in its domestic legal order, and one means of doing so could be the adoption of a Bill of Rights".

82. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt paragraph 22, as amended.

83. It was so decided.

Paragraph 29

84. Mr. ABOUL-NASR proposed that the paragraph should be deleted.

85. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to delete paragraph 29.

86. It was so decided.

Paragraph 30

87. Mr. WOLFRUM proposed that paragraph 30 should be adopted since the recommendation it contained related to an administrative matter.

88. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt paragraph 30.

89. It was so decided.

Paragraph 32

90. Mr. ABOUL-NASR, supported by Mr. CHIGOVERA, considered that the recommendation to the People's Republic of China could not appropriately be included in the concluding observations concerning the report of the United Kingdom.

91. Mr. RECHETOV replied that the Committee was simply expressing the wish that the People's Republic of China, which was a party to the Convention, would transmit information on Hong Kong. The fact that the recommendation was made in the concluding observations concerning the report of the United Kingdom was merely a technical matter.

92. Mr. GARVALOV proposed that the passive voice should be used and that there should be no explicit reference to China in the paragraph, which should read: "The Committee expresses the hope that with the change of sovereignty over Hong Kong, with effect from 1 July 1997, the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region will be given due attention in periodic reports".

93. Mr. ABOUL-NASR observed that what was involved was not a change but a return of sovereignty; the proposed wording was unclear.

94. Mr. CHIGOVERA pointed out that the report under consideration was that of the United Kingdom, that what was involved was indeed a return of sovereignty and that the question raised was pointless since China had, in its most recent periodic report, transmitted information on all the territories under its jurisdiction.

95. Mr. WOLFRUM, supported by Mr. YUTZIS, agreed with Mr. Chigovera that there was no reason to assume that China would not transmit information on Hong Kong and proposed that paragraph 32 should be deleted.

96. The CHAIRMAN noted the views of the majority of the members of the Committee and proposed that paragraph 32 should be deleted.

97. It was so decided.

Additional paragraph

98. The CHAIRMAN announced that Mr. de Gouttes had proposed that the following paragraph should be added: "The Committee suggests that in its next report the State party include, for a recent year, (a) or (1) a review of the number of cases commenced under the Race Relations Act 1976 and their outcomes; (b) or (2) information on the number of prosecutions for offences of a racist character with an indication of sentences imposed in representative cases".

99. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the new paragraph.

100. It was so decided.

101. The draft concluding observations of the Committee concerning the fourteenth periodic report of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland as a whole, as orally amended, was adopted.

102. Mr. SHERIFIS, supported by Mr. ABOUL-NASR, congratulated the Chairman on the objectivity he had displayed on the occasion of the adoption of the draft concluding observations concerning the periodic report of his country.

Draft concluding observations of the Committee concerning the review of the implementation of the Convention in Afghanistan (CERD/C/50/Misc.4/Rev.1, distributed at the meeting in English only)

103. Mr. SHAHI observed that it was at present difficult to know who was governing Afghanistan.

104. The CHAIRMAN said that a communication would be sent to the Afghan Government when that Government became known.

105. Mr. AHMADU recalled that the problem had already arisen in the case of Somalia and hoped that the position taken by the Committee would be consistent.

106. The CHAIRMAN, said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft concluding observations concerning the review of the implementation of the Convention in Afghanistan, as proposed by Mr. Wolfrum, Country Rapporteur.

107. It was so decided.

Draft concluding observations of the Committee concerning the review of the implementation of the Convention in the Bahamas (CERD/C/50/Misc.5/Rev.1, distributed at the meeting in English only)

108. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft concluding observations concerning the review of the implementation of the Convention in the Bahamas, as proposed by Mr. Lechuga Hevia, Country Rapporteur.

109. It was so decided.

Draft concluding observations of the Committee concerning the review of the implementation of the Convention in the Dominican Republic (CERD/C/50/Misc.6/Rev.1, distributed at the meeting in English only)

110. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft concluding observations concerning the review of the implementation of the Convention in the Dominican Republic, as proposed by Mr. Valencia Rodriguez, Country Rapporteur.

111. It was so decided.

Draft concluding observations of the Committee concerning the review of the implementation of the Convention in Jordan (CERD/C/50/Misc.13/Rev.2, distributed at the meeting in English only)

112. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft concluding observations concerning the review of the implementation of the Convention in Jordan, as proposed by Mr. van Boven, Country Rapporteur.

113. It was so decided.

Draft concluding observations of the Committee concerning the review of the implementation of the Convention in Nepal (CERD/C/50/Misc.14/Rev.1, distributed at the meeting in English only)

114. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft concluding observations concerning the review of the implementation of the Convention in Nepal, as proposed by Mrs. Sadiq Ali, Country Rapporteur.

115. It was so decided.

Draft concluding observations of the Committee concerning the review of the implementation of the Convention in Cameroon (CERD/C/50/Misc.17/Rev.1, distributed at the meeting in English only)

116. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there was no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft concluding observations concerning the review of the implementation of the Convention in Cameroon, as proposed by Mr. de Gouttes, Country Rapporteur.

117. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.